DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 413 SP 006 386

TITLE	The Bowling Green State University Teacher Learning Center Concept.
INSTITUTION	Bowling Green State Univ., Ohio.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; *Program Descriptions; *Resource Teachers; *Student Teachers; *Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	*Distinguished Achievement Award Entry

ABSTRACT

The Teacher Learning Center, developed by Bowling Green State University (BGSU), was designed as a public school-university cooperative approach to teacher education. The BGSU center was organized for a team teaching approach with two student teachers assigned to each cooperating teacher for 11 weeks. The 20 to 24 student teachers placed in the center offered a variety of backgrounds and experiences to be used as resources for all pupils in the school. (A case study, evaluation, methodology, and results are included. Appendixes present questionnaires.) (MJM)

ED 075413

THE BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHER LEARNING CENTER CONCEPT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Entry

1973 Distinguished Achievement
Awards Program

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Submitted by

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
Bowling Green, Ohio

President

Hollis A. Moore, Jr.

SP 006 386

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF APPENDIXES	vi
A SUMMARY STATEMENT	vii
THE BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHER LEARNING CENTER CONCEPT	1
THE BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY - WHITMER COMPLEX TEACHER LEARNING CENTER: A CASE STUDY	6
EVALUATION	8
METHODOLOGY	9
RESULTS	10
Individualized Instruction	11
Student Teachers: A Source of New Ideas and Materials	16
Impact of Student Teachers on the Effectiveness of Cooperating Teachers	19
Suggestions as to the Attitude of Administration and Teachers Toward Student Teaching	21
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	25
APPENDIXES	27
A. Student Questionnaire	28
B. Teacher Questionnaire	33
C. Student Teacher Questionnaire	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

Pupil Perception

1.1 Extent Pupil Received Work As An Individual 11

1.2 Extent Cooperating Teacher Worked With Individual Pupils As Compared To When Student Teacher Not Present 12

1.3 Extent Amount of Small Group Instruction Changes Because of Student Teacher's Presence 12

1.4 Extent Individual Attention Changed Because of Student Teacher's Presence 13

Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher Perception

1.5 Extent Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers Reported Working With Individual Students 13

1.6 Extent Cooperating Teacher Worked With Individual Pupils As Compared To When Student Teacher is Not Present 14

1.7 Extent Amount of Small Group Instruction Changed Because of Student Teacher's Presence 14

1.8 Extent Individual Attention Changed Because of Student Teacher's Presence 15

Pupil Perceptions

2.1 Extent Student Teacher Brought New of Different Instructional Materials 16

Table

Page

2.2 Extent Student Teacher Brought New or Different Ideas or Aids 16

2.3 Extent Contributions Used 17

Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher Perceptions

2.4 Extent Student Teacher Brought New or Different Instructional Materials 17

2.5 Extent Student Teacher Brought New or Different Ideas or Aids 18

2.6 Extent Contributions Used 18

Pupil Perceptions

3.1 Effect Working With Student Teachers Had on the Performance of the Cooperating Teacher 20

3.2 Extent of Feelings about Two Student Teachers Working With Cooperating Teacher As A Team - Team Effectiveness 20

Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher Perceptions

3.3 Effect Working With Student Teachers Had on the Performance of the Cooperating Teacher 21

Pupil Perceptions

4.1 What Should attitude of Administration and Teachers Be About Working With Student Teachers 22

Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher Perceptions

4.2 What Should Attitude of Administration and Teachers Be About Working With Student Teachers 22

Table — Page

2.2 Extent Student Teacher Brought New or Different Ideas or Aids 16

2.3 Extent Contributions Used 17

Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher Perceptions

2.4 Extent Student Teacher Brought New or Different Instructional Materials 17

2.5 Extent Student Teacher Brought New or Different Ideas or Aids 18

2.6 Extent Contributions Used 18

Pupil Perceptions

3.1 Effect Working With Student Teachers Had on the Performance of the Cooperating Teacher 20

3.2 Extent of Feelings about Two Student Teachers Working With Cooperating Teacher As A Team - Team Effectiveness 20

Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher Perceptions

3.3 Effect Working With Student Teachers Had on the Performance of the Cooperating Teacher 21

Pupil Perceptions

4.1 What Should attitude of Administration and Teachers Be About Working With Student Teachers 22

Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher Perceptions

4.2 What Should Attitude of Administration and Teachers Be About Working With Student Teachers 22

Table | Page

5.1 Effect on Student Teachers on some Instructional Activities as Reported by Pupils, Cooperating Teachers, and Student Teachers 23

5.2 School - Related Activities Engaged in by Cooperating Teachers During Time Student Teachers Were Present as Reported by Cooperating Teachers 24

THE BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
TEACHER LEARNING CENTER CONCEPT

A SUMMARY STATEMENT

Bowling Green State University has developed the Teacher Learning Center as a public school-university cooperative approach to teacher education. Each of these institutions offers a unique set of resources to all participants. Teachers, student teachers, schools, the university, and especially pupils benefit from additional personnel who provide: (1) opportunities for individualized instruction, (2) new ideas and materials, (3) increased professional motivation and competence, and (4) field-based research and in-service activities.

A BGSU Center is organized for a team teaching approach with two student teachers assigned to each cooperating teacher for a period of eleven weeks. Working as a triad, a team functions to plan, discuss, research and provide learning experiences that meet pupil's individual needs. The twenty to twenty-four student teachers placed in a Center offer a variety of backgrounds and experiences to be used as resources for all pupils in the school. As a Center, the public school acquires access to the assets of the BGSU Library and Audio-Visual Centers, and these advantages are available as additional resources for pupils. In utilizing the student teachers' experiences, capabilities, and their ideas and materials, the cooperating teachers become more effective as teachers in their assigned responsibilities.

As a major factor of the Center Program, BGSU provides a

full-time, school-based Clinical Supervisor to (1) supervise individualized programs for student teachers, (2) provide in-service activities for the school's faculty, (3) offer liaison between the university and the school, and (4) research and develop new and better methods of learning, teaching, and communicating with kids, teachers, parents, and community.

THE BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
TEACHER LEARNING CENTER CONCEPT

The Bowling Green State University Teacher Learning Center Concept was developed as a cooperative approach to teacher education, and is currently in the third year of operation. Designers of the program recognized the need for more effective utilization of resources available in the student teaching program, and the advantages that could be offered to pupils if the organization allowed for greater opportunities in individualized instruction and shared responsibilities. The BGSU Teacher Learning Center Concept was conceived as a team approach to lower the teacher-pupil ratio in the classroom, to promote team teaching, small and large group instruction, individual tutoring and counseling, and increase the variety of instructional techniques and teacher-pupil interaction.

Student teachers from Bowling Green State University are placed in public school-university cooperative Centers in the four major areas of Social Studies, English, Science and Mathematics. Two student teachers are assigned to each cooperating teacher for a period of 11 weeks. Working as a triad, the team members function as resource persons to plan, present, discuss, research and provide learning experiences that meet pupils' individual needs. The teams may use a variety of approaches. Some alternatives are:

(1) Small and large group instruction, alternating the structure to fit topic needs for debate, conflict, research, discussion, and others.

(2) Team leader approach with supportive personnel. One team member is responsible for planning, presentation and evaluation, with other members doing research, typing, duplicating, taking attendance, handling make-up work, individualized instruction, and the many other necessary non-teaching activities of the teacher role.

(3) Individual teacher is responsible for a self-contained classroom for a unit or specific period of time, performing all the duties of a classroom teacher, while still retaining access to the team.

The teaching teams conceive and use other alternative structures as best fit their subject areas and individual situations.

Twenty to twenty-five student teachers are placed in a Center. They offer a variety of backgrounds and experiences, and these resourses are available to all pupils in the school. The student teachers bring new ideas, methods and materials to the classrooms. As a Center, the public school, in effect, acquires access to the instructional and material assets of the Bowling Green State University Library and Audio-Visual Center, and these advantages are available as additional resources for their pupils. In utilizing the student teachers' experiences, capabilities, and their ideas and materials, the cooperating teachers become more effective in their exposure to pupils and in completing their assigned responsibilities. The cooperating teachers are constantly involved in teaching, planning, and researching with and for the team. In the Center concept, the cooperating teacher <u>does not</u> submit the class to the student teacher to handle alone for the entire quarter, but instead supplements the instruction with the capabilities of the whole team.

As a major factor of the Center Program, Bowling Green State University provides a full-time, school-based Clinical Supervisor to (1) supervise individualized programs for student teachers, (2) provide

in-service activities for cooperating teachers and other faculty, (3) offer liaison between the university and the school, and (4) research and develop new and better methods of learning, teaching, and communicating with kids, teachers, parents, and community.

Since the first responsibility of the public school is to the development of its pupils and not to serve as a teacher training institution, it is important to recognize the effects of the student teaching program on the instructional program of the school. All concerned in this cooperative student teaching program offer a unique set of resources and the student teaching program is designed to permit the ready flow of these resources among all participants. To work effectively, the program must be beneficial to all concerned and meet the objectives as follows:

TO THE TEACHERS AND THE SCHOOL

1. Increased resources for classroom instruction and research to provide new and exciting programs for the pupils.
2. Additional personnel with new ideas and methods.
3. A lower pupil-teacher ratio. With the addition of 2 student teachers per room, a ratio of 10-1 or less may be achieved.
4. Released time for the cooperating teacher, at times, for research, in-service work, committee work, curriculum development, etc.
5. Opportunities for more individualized instruction and individual work.
6. More planning, in greater detail, to utilize the additional resources provided by the Center.
7. A healthy psychological effect upon experienced teachers. Student teachers often inspire the experienced professionals to greater performance and the cooperating teachers become more effective in completing their responsibilities to the pupils.

8. Enrich the school program with the many talents of the student teachers in art, music, athletics, and dramatics. All are additonal resources for the pupils.

9. An excellent source for employment of beginning teachers whose abilities are already scrutinized, with the result that more valid judgements of possible performance can be made.

10. Flexibility in planning more activities with the additional personnel. The classes can do things that were impossible with one teacher.

TO THE PUPILS IN THE SCHOOL

1. Additional resources, new ideas and a stimulating learning climate provided by professionals-in-preparation in association with experienced professionals.

2. Increased personnel for individual attention and instruction as cooperating and student teachers team for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

TO THE STUDENT TEACHER

1. Opportunities to develop at their own pace and to reach higher levels of competency, if capable.

2. Contacts with outstanding teachers and experiences with varied techniques and styles of teaching.

3. Opportunity to gain experience and observe the many kinds of programs and activities in the school community.

4. Observation and contact with new teachers to gain insight into many problems of their first year.

5. Gain experience in problems of handling "difficult," "different," and "normal" student groups.

6. Experience instructional and interaction techniques for slow learners, academically talented, as well as the "normal" students.

7. Experience team teaching, differentiated staffing and self-contained classroom methods for providing the learning climate.

8. Develop skills in group dynamics, questioning, small and large group interaction, planning techniques, inquiry and discovery teaching programs, defining objectives, developing focused instructional strategies and evaluation.

TO THE UNIVERSITY

1. A program developing "better" teachers with broad and varied backgrounds of experience in the public school setting.

2. More effective and efficient use of university personnel. The coordinator no longer spends most of the time traveling, but can be where he is most useful, with the students in his charge.

3. Increased contact with individual students to effectively solve the unique problems each encounters.

4. Opportunity to offer and develop in-service programs for teachers in the cooperating public school.

5. Opportunity for university personnel to relate the theoretical and the practical as more time is spent in the public school setting.

6. Constant and continuous liaison with the public school personnel and administration to promote programs in educational research and development.

BUDGET

The operating budget for the Teacher Learning Centers is provided by the normal allocations for operation fo the Office of Student Teaching. No federal monies or other grants are involved. Cost analyses within the office have determined the operating cost of the Centers to be comparable with the traditional program of individual placement in many schools. The Clinical Supervisor in the Center fulfills a normal supervisory load of 20 to 24 student teachers, consistent with the normal loads of non-center supervisors. The university provides the salary and travel expense monies, while the public school provides the physical facilities, materials for instruction and planning, video-tape equipment, and stipends for in-service workshop activities.

THE BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY - WHITMER COMPLEX
TEACHER LEARNING CENTER: A CASE STUDY

The Bowling Green State University - Whitmer Complex Teacher Learning Center is located at the Whitmer High School, north of Toledo, bordering the Ohio - Michigan state line. It is part of the Washington Local School District, a portion of which lies within the city boundaries of Toledo. Washington Local Schools is the largest local school district in Ohio with an enrollment of over 11,000 students. Located in a well developed and stable suburban community of 76,000, many of the residents are college graduates with positions of responsibility in the professions, business, and industry. The system includes thirteen elementary schools as well as the secondary complex. It is located within a 30 minute drive of Bowling Green State University.

The secondary complex is composed of three buildings on a single site under one administrative arrangement. The Jefferson Building enrolls approximately 950 eighth graders; the Washington Building 950 ninth graders; and the Whitmer Building 2700 students, grades ten through twelve. Mr. Boyd Martin is the principal of the complex. Mr. Don Bahna, associate principal, and Dr. Ted Aceto, assistant principal, were closely involved in the establishment and the operation of the Center. Dr. Don Chase directed the Center for Bowling Green State University.

The Whitmer Complex has instituted and continued development of many new educational tools. These include:

-two resource centers in each building
-a non-graded approach to learning (one of two such high schools in the state)

-an extensive audio visual production center to aid teachers in the production of teaching materials
-a full and part-time independent study program
-a modified science open lab concept
-a semester English elective program
-a semester social studies elective program
-a staggered school day
-commons areas replacing study halls
-growing team teaching programs
-an advanced physical education program, using community facilities for carry-over sports
-vocational education facilities and programs

Student teaching positions through the center are available in English, Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics. Positions are also available in a unique General Studies Program. This course is entitled "Man and His Environment" and is team taught in a five-hour block of time by Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and English teachers, and involves a totally integrated program revolving around such concept areas as; Psychology, Consumer Economics, Environment, Law and Society, Religion and Values, Ethnic Studies, Applied Esthetics, Creative Studies, Futurism, and Occupations and Professions.

Bowling Green State University student teachers are involved in many different programs gaining team as well as individual experiences. Each has extensive preparation in planning for structured and unstructured activities, traditional and innovative programs, and for pupils of varied abilities and motivations. Experience is gained with programs such as Intermediate Science Curriculum Study (ISCS), a humanities approach to 8th grade History and English, courses such as Black Voices, The American Dream, The Bible as Literature, Change, Philosophy, Education as well as the more traditional approaches.

Student teachers participate regularly in seminar activities designed to meet their immediate and long-range needs. Group interaction

is stressed in activities such as: Behavioral Objectives, Instructional Strategies and Evaluation; Flander's Interaction Analysis for Self-Evaluation; Questioning Techniques; Critical Thinking; Audio-Visual Techniques and Materials; Technical Skills in Teaching; Group Interaction Techniques and Skills; and Discipline. Skills in the classroom for positive interaction with pupils are developed and evaluated in a competency-based program.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the Bowling Green State University - Whitmer Complex Student Teaching Center has been a continuous process. During the 1971 - 1972 Academic Year, a series of questionnaires were given to sample the opinions of pupils, supervising teachers and student teachers. As perceived by pupils, cooperating teachers and student teachers, the possible impact of the student teaching program on the instructional program was surveyed in several areas. The main questions of concern in this were:

(1) As a result of the Bowling Green State University Student Teachers and the Center concept, are the pupils in the school receiving more individual attention and individualized instruction?

(2) Are the Bowling Green State University Student Teachers bringing new and different materials, new ideas and aids to the Whitmer Complex, and are these materials and ideas being used?

(3) Have the Bowling Green State University Student Teachers had a healthy psychological effect upon the experienced cooperating teachers to increase their performance and increase their effectiveness with pupils?

(4) What should be the attitude of the administration and teachers in the school about student teachers working in the school?

Personnel Involvement

The population of this study was composed of: (1) 619 pupils from grades 8-12 of the Whitmer Complex, (2) 10 cooperating teachers, reflecting the four major disciplines previously named. The cooperating teachers' group consisted wholly of experienced teachers, the range of experience being from 4 to 12 years. All had had previous experiences with student teachers from as many as 3 different colleges and universities. (3) 37 Bowling Green State University student teachers completing the student teaching experience during Fall and Winter Quarters, 1971-1972, at the Whitmer Complex.

Methodology

Each pupil, cooperating teacher and student teacher completed one questionnaire. The questionnaires were similar for each group, with questions pertaining to the objectives of the study. The data were collected from pupils on IBM 1230 answer sheets and processed by computer at Bowling Green State University. Cooperating teacher and student teacher data were collected by direct response on the questionnaire and results tabulated by the investigator. The sample was a population with all student teachers (N=37) and cooperating teachers (N-10) responding. The pupil sample (N=619) was a complete population, with the exception of those who happened to be absent on the day the survey was taken. No efforts were made to poll those who were missed due to that absence. Students involved in more than one class with the program completed only one questionnaire.

The items for the questionnaire were provided from a recent study directed by the Deans and Directors of Michigan Teacher Education Institutions. This "Student Teaching Impact Study" was conducted during the Fall of 1969 to determine the effect of student teaching programs upon cooperating public schools. Educational research consultants from 3 different institutions in Michigan were involved in the planning of the study and the development of the survey instruments. A total of 4397 cooperating teachers and 4483 student teachers responded to the Michigan survey. For the present study, items were selected from the "Impact Study" which were relevent to the Center operation and directed answers to the questions raised. Some "Impact" items were altered, in descriptive terms only, to fit the local situation. The pupil questionnaire is a shortened version of the other instruments. A copy of the questionnaire for each group is included in the Appendix.

RESULTS

Results of the study, as they apply to the questions raised, are presented as, and limited to, absolute and relative frequency response for each group (pupil, cooperating teacher, student teacher).[1] Individualized Instruction, Student Teachers As A Source of New and Different Ideas and Materials, Impact of Student Teachers on the Effectiveness of Cooperating Teachers and The Suggested Attitude of Administration and Teachers Toward Student Teachers are the four variables studies and discussed, as they are perceived by each group.

---

[1]Additional statistical information is available, including cross-tabulation for all variables by grade and subject.

1. Individualized Instruction

The philosophy of the Whitmer Complex includes, "Individualized instruction, developing a program of learning prescribed to the aptitudes, abilities and needs of each individual student." It is assumed that if the people directly involved in the program perceive this to be happening, then the Center is possibly having an impact on the school's instructional program. When questioned about individualized instruction, pupils (n=619) responded as indicated in the following tables.

Table 1.1 -- Because of the Student Teacher's Presence, To What Extent Did You Receive Work (instruction, counseling, tutoring,) As An Individual Pupil?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)
Positive Response	562	90.8
Negative Response	52	8.4
Undecided	5	0.8
Totals	619	100

Valid Observations N=619

Table 1.2 -- Because of the Student Teacher's Presence, To What Extent Did Your Teacher Work With You As An Individual Pupil As Compared To When He Does Not Have A Student Teacher?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
More	159	25.7	25.7
Same	264	42.6	68.3
Less	88	14.2	82.5
Undecided	108	17.4	99.9
Totals	619	99.9	99.9

Valid Observations N=619

Table 1.3 -- To What Extent Was the Amount of Small Group Instruction for the Students Changed Because of the Student Teacher's Presence?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
More	408	65.9	65.9
Same	184	29.7	95.6
Less	27	4.4	100.0
Totals	619	100	100

Valid Observations N=619

Table 1.4 -- To What Extent Was the Individual Attention To, or Tutoring of, Pupils Changed Because of The Student Teacher's Presence?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)	Cumulative Frequency (percent)
More	412	66.6	66.6
Same	174	28.1	94.7
Less	33	5.3	100.0
Totals	619	100.0	100.0

Valid Observations N=619

Cooperating teachers and student teachers replied to the same questions with the following responses.

Table 1.5 -- Because of the Student Teacher's Presence, To What Extent Did You Work With (instruct, counsel, tutor) Individual Pupils?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
Positive Response	8	37	80	100
Negative Response	1	0	10	0
Undecided	1	0	10	0
Totals	10	37	100	100

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

Table 1.6 -- Because of the Student Teacher's Presence, To What Extent Did the Cooperating Teacher Work With Individuals Pupils As Compared To When the Student Teacher Is Not Present?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
More	8	28	80	75.7
Same	1	6	10	16.2
Less	1	0	10	0
Undecided	0	3	0	8.1
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

Table 1.7 -- To What Extent Was the Amount of Small Group Instruction for the Students Changed Because of the Student Teacher's Presence?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
More	8	34	80	91.8
Same	1	2	10	5.7
Less	1	0	10	0
Don't Know	0	1	0	2.5
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

Table 1.8 -- To What Extent Was the Individual Attention to, or Tutoring of, Pupils Changed Because of the Student Teacher's Presence?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
More	8	34	80	91.8
Same	1	2	10	5.7
Less	1	0	10	0
Don't Know	0	1	0	2.5
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

It should be noted that there is considerable agreement among the pupils, cooperating teachers and student teachers that more individualized instruction and individual attention is being provided for the pupils involved in the program. About 91% of the pupils and student teachers indicated individual pupils were receiving counseling, tutoring, or individual instruction. 80% of the cooperating teachers agreed. There is agreement that the program structure allows for greater opportunities in individualization and these opportunities are being accepted by all groups concerned. The cooperating teacher is available for individual work as participation in the team permits more time for these important activities. The chances for individual counseling, instruction, tutoring and small group instruction are greater because of the additional personnel. Student teachers find many opportunities for individualization and the pupils in the school are perceiving this as an advantage in a large majority of cases.

2. Student Teachers as a Source of New and Different Ideas and Materials

One of the claimed benefits of the Center approach is the promise of increased resources for classroom instruction as student teachers provide new and different ideas and materials. Of related concern is whether the materials and ideas, once presented, are being used. Pupil response is as follows:

Table 2.1 -- Did the Student Teacher Bring, Develop, Provide, or Suggest Any New or Different Instructional Materials?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)
Positive Response	436	70.4
Negative Response	66	10.7
Don't Know	117	18.9
Totals	619	100.0

Valid Observations N=619

Table 2.2 -- Did the Student Teacher Suggest or Provide Any Other Kinds of Aid or Ideas?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)
Positive Response	455	73.5
Negative Response	70	11.3
Don't Know	94	15.2
Totals	619	100.0

Valid Observations N=619

Table 2.3 -- Were the Contributions Received and Used?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)
Positive Response	493	79.6
Negative Response	114	18.4
Don't Know	12	1.9
Totals	619	99.9

Valid Observations N=619

Cooperating teachers and student teachers perceived the above as indicated by the following tables:

Table 2.4 -- Did the Student Teacher Bring, Develop, Provide, or Suggest Any New or Different Instructional Materials?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
Positive Response	10	33	100	89.2
Negative Response	0	11	0	2.7
Don't Know	0	3	0	8.1
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

Table 2.5 -- Did the Student Teacher Suggest or Provide Any Other Kinds of Aids or Idea?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
Positive Response	10	35	100	94.6
Negative Response	0	1	0	2.7
Don't Know	0	1	0	2.7
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observation N=10, N=37

Table 2.6 -- Were the Contributions Received and Used?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
Positive Response	10	36	100	97.3
Negative Response	0	1	0	2.7
Don't Know	0	0	0	0
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

One of the goals of the Center program is to provide new and different materials and ideas for the benefit of pupils in the classes involved. Even though the pupils are not always involved in planning, they

appear to have perceived that the student teachers are providing these benefits, and that these aids are being used. Cooperating teachers are especially aware of these additional resources and unanimously agreed that there was an increase in ideas and materials available for classroom utilization. Student teachers, during both quarters, made extensive use of the Bowling Green State University Library, Audio-Visual Materials Center, Speakers, films, slides and other aids from campus. They appeared to make valuable use of resources from outside school facilities, and supplemented the instructional program with ideas and materials that might not otherwise have been used. The individual expertise of student teachers was quite evident as they volunteered for extra duties in extra curricular areas of the school program. A majority of pupils, cooperating teachers and student teachers perceived the benefits were provided and used.

3. The Impact of Student Teachers on the Effectiveness of Cooperating Teachers

It has been stated that student teachers can have a healthy psychological effect upon experienced teachers as they inspire the experienced professionals to greater performance. As a result, cooperating teachers can be expected to become more effective in completing their responsibilities in the classroom. Teachers quite often express frustration over the many activities and experiences they would like to provide, but cannot because of lack of time and personnel. The Bowling Green State University Center approach can provide them with the personnel and the time as a result. These additional personnel, with new ideas and materials, can help provide a lower pupil-teacher ratio, more planning time, and greater

flexibility in planning activities. The teams, if properly organized and used, can increase the effectiveness of cooperating teachers in fulfilling their assigned responsibilities. Pupils perceive this to be happening as indicated in the following tables:

Table 3.1 -- What Effect Do You Feel Working With Student Teachers Has Had on the Performance of the Cooperating Teacher?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)
More Effective	451	72.9
No Effect	154	24.9
Less Effective	10	1.6
Don't Know	4	0.6
Totals	619	100.0

Valid Observations N=619

Table 3.2 -- What Are Your Feelings About Having Two Student Teachers Working With the Cooperating Teacher As A Team?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)
Effective	397	64.1
No Difference	114	18.4
Not Effective	108	17.4
Totals	619	99.9

Valid Observations N=619

Cooperating teachers and student teachers responded in the following:

Table 3.3 -- What Effect Do You Feel Working With Student Teachers Has Had On the Performance of the Cooperating Teacher?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
More Effective	8	32	80	86.5
No Effect	2	1	20	2.7
Less Effective	0	0	0	0
Don't Know	0	4	0	10.8
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

It appears that a significant number of pupils, cooperating teachers and student teachers agree that the effectiveness of the cooperating teacher has increased as a result of the Center program.

4. Suggestions as to the Attitude of Administration and Teachers Toward Student Teaching

Persons not involved in the Center program have indicated that there might be negative feelings toward student teachers and student teaching by the pupils and teachers in the school. If this were the case, then possibly the benefits offered are not being utilized. Pupils, cooperating teachers and student teachers were asked how they felt about student teaching. Pupils responded in the following manner:

Table 4.1 -- What Do You Think Should Be the Attitude of the Administration and Teachers in the School About Working With Student Teachers?

	Absolute Frequency (number)	Relative Frequency (percent)
Positive Response	595	96.1
Negative Response	24	3.9
Totals	619	100.0

Valid Observations N=619

Cooperating teachers and student teachers recorded their responses.

Table 4.2 -- What Do You Think Should Be the Attitude of the Administration and Teachers in the School About Working With Student Teachers?

	Absolute Frequency (number)		Relative Frequency (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
Positive Response	10	36	100	97.4
Negative Response	0	0	0	0
Uncertain	0	1	0	2.6
Totals	10	37	100	100.0

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

It seems apparent that the Center and the student teachers are quite welcome in the school. A strong majority of the respondents of all three groups have indicated that student teachers should be used.

Table 5.1 -- Effect of Student Teachers on some Instructional Activities As Reported by Pupils, Cooperating Teachers, and Student Teachers.

Activity	Positive Response[1] (percent increase)			Negative Response[1] (percent decrease)		
	Pupil	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Pupil	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
Small Group Instruction	65.9	80	91.8	4.4	10	0
Provision for Make-up Work	33.9	50	75.7	13.1	10	0
Follow-up Exams	43.3	40	70	10.8	0	10
Individual Attention	66.6	80	91.8	5.4	10	0
Supervision of Study Periods	46.5	50	73	15.5	10	0
Amount of Material Covered	50.9	40	75.7	12.2	10	2.7
Discipline	29.6	30	75.7	24.3	20	13.5
Motivation of Pupils	55.1	80	78.4	12.3	10	2.7

Valid Observations N=619, N=10, N=37

[1]100 minus total of positive and negative responses equals no change or don't know.

Table 5.2 -- School-Related Activities Engaged in by Cooperating Teachers. During Time Student Teachers were Present As Reported by Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers.

Activity	Positive Response[1] (percent)		Negative Response[1] (percent)	
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher
Team Teaching	100	97.4	0	2.6
Visitations	80	75.7	20	13.5
Committee Work	80	86.0	20	0
Research (Planning, etc.)	100	86.0	0	2.7
Professional Reading-Writing	90	75.7	10	2.7
Working With Staff Or Department	80	78.4	20	5.7
Social or Recreational	20	21.6	80	57

Valid Observations N=10, N=37

[1]100 minus total of positive and negative responses equals no change or don't know.

Summary and Conclusions

This study was instituted to answer four major questions concerning the possible impact of the Bowling Green State University - Whitmer Complex Student Teaching Center on the instructional program of the school. The Center was devised as a cooperative approach to teacher education beneficial to pupils, teachers, schools, student teachers and the university. It was assumed that if the program could help increase individualized instruction and attention to pupils, provide additional resources in ideas and materials to be used with the pupils and increase the effectiveness of the cooperating teachers in their interaction with pupils, then the program would be a success. It appeared improbable to measure these variables in terms of pupil gain, so evaluation consisted of surveying the perceptions of those most closely involved in the program. All cooperating teachers (N=10), all pupils (N=619), with the exception of those absent on the days of testing, were polled to sample their opinions. Each person involved completed one questionnaire.

Results of the survey appear quite satisfying. Pupils, cooperating teachers and student teachers agree as to the value of the program in meeting the objectives or benefits as stated. Five hundred sixty-two pupils (90.8%) felt they were receiving individualized instruction because of the student teacher's presence. Approximately two-thirds of the pupils surveyed indicated they were receiving more individual attention because of the student teacher's presence. Approximately 80% of the pupils felt the new ideas and materials brought to the school by student teachers were being used, while 100% of the cooperating teachers and 97%

of the student teachers agreed.

About three-fourths of the pupils responded the cooperating teachers had become more effective as teachers as a result of the student teachers presence, and 80% of the cooperating teachers and 86.5% of the student teacher concurred. As a further indication of their support for the program, 96.1% of the pupils polled indicated the program should continue with the administration and teachers seeking and accepting student teachers in the school.

This study appears to indicate the Bowling Green State University - Whitmer Complex Student Teaching Center is having a favorable impact on the instructional program of the school. The anticipated benefits seem to be occurring and the pupils in the school are the major recipients of the advantages gained.

The center concept, in addition, appears to have had recognizable effects on the improvement of teacher education, both pre-service and in-service. Student teachers are developing skills in team teaching, individualized instruction, cooperative planning, and many others. Cooperating teachers are involved in the same processes as they work consistently in team teaching, instead of turn teaching, to meet the needs of the pupils in their charge. They are involved with new materials, challenged with new ideas in seminars and workshops, and are involved with other university and public school personnel in working to increase effectiveness in the classroom. This added involvement and enthusiasm appears to be successfully affecting cooperating teacher performance, and provides the BGSU Teacher Education Program with a positive and satisfying dimension in teacher preparation.

Appendix A

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your sex?

   1. Male
   2. Female

Questions 2 through 7 deal with any changes in individualized instruction provided for students which may have resulted from the student teacher's presence.

2. To what extent did you receive work (instruction, counseling, tutoring,)as an individual pupil?

   1. A great deal
   2. To some extent
   3. A little bit
   4. Not at all

3. To what extent did your teacher work with you as an individual pupil as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?

   1. Much more than usual
   2. Somewhat more than usual
   3. About the same as usual
   4. Somewhat less than usual
   5. Much less than usual
   6. Don't know

4. To what extent was individual help or counseling provided you during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if the student teacher had not been present?

   1. Much more than usual
   2. Somewhat more than usual
   3. About the same as usual
   4. Somewhat less than usual
   5. Much less than usual
   6. Don't know

5. To what extent did conferring with the student teacher take time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?

   1. Frequently
   2. Sometimes
   3. Seldom
   4. Never
   5. Don't know

6. To what extent did planning with the student teacher take the time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?

   1. Frequently
   2. Sometimes
   3. Seldom
   4. Never
   5. Don't know

7. To what extent was re-teaching necessary after the student teacher taught?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Don't know

Questions 8 through 16: To what extent were any of the following instructional activities for the students changed because of the student teacher's presence?

8. Amount of small group instruction

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

9. Provision for make-up work

1. Much greater
2. Somewhat greater
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

10. Follow-up exams

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

11. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

12. Supervision of study periods

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply
7. Don't know

13. Supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply
7. Don't know

14. Amount of material covered

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

15. Discipline

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

16. Motivation of pupils

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

Questions 17 through 24 deal with the contributions the student teachers may have made to the school program. Did they make any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

17. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No

18. Give talks to parent's groups?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No

19. Perform recess, lunch, playground, or hall duty?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No

20. Did the student teacher bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No
4. I am not sure

21. Did the student teacher suggest or provide any other kinds of aid or ideas?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No
4. I am not sure

22. How do you feel the contributions (20 and 21) were received?

1. They were used
2. They were not used
3. I was discouraged from making such contributions
4. I really did not have much to offer

23. How many hours per week on the average did the student teacher teach the supervising teacher's assigned classes?

1. Less than an hour a week
2. One to five hours per week
3. Six to ten hours a week
4. Eleven to fifteen hours a week
5. Sixteen to twenty hours a week
6. More than twenty hours a week

24. How many hours per week on the average was the supervising teacher away from the classroom while the student teachers were teaching his assigned classes?

1. Less than 1
2. 1 to 5
3. 6 to 10
4. 11 to 15
5. 16 to 20
6. More than 20

Questions 25 through 32: To what extent did the supervising teacher engage in any of the following activities during the time the student teachers were teaching in his assigned class?

25. Team teaching with the student teacher?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

26. Visitation in other classrooms or schools?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

27. Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

28. Research

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

29. Professional reading or writing

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

30. Work with staff of school or department

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

31. Participating in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

32. Assisting the principal or other teachers

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

Questions 33 and 34: To what extent was the time the supervising teacher spent on the following activities changed because of the student teacher's absence?

33. Help to individual students

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

34. Evaluating students' progress and activities

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

35. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the performance of the supervising teacher?

1. Has made him a much more effective teacher
2. Has made him a more effective teacher
3. Has had no effect on his teaching
4. Has made him a less effective teacher
5. Has made him a much less effective teacher
6. I am unable to judge

36. What do you think should be the attitude of the administration and teachers in the school about working with student teachers?

1. Should aggressively seek student teachers
2. Should seek student teachers
3. Should accept student teachers if asked
4. Should resist having student teachers in the school
5. Should refuse to have student teachers in the school
6. I am unable to judge

37. What are your feelings about having two student teachers in the classroom working with the supervising teacher as a team?

1. Team is very effective
2. Team is effective
3. No difference
4. Team is not effective
5. Team causes confusion

38. Assuming the team members are resource people for your use and benefit, how many do you feel can do the best job?

1. Eight
2. Six
3. Four
4. Two
5. One

Appendix B

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which of the following are you now?

    1. A supervising (cooperating, sponsoring) teacher
    2. A supervising teacher, but with a part-time administrative assignment in addition to teaching
    3. A school administrator

2. What is your sex?

    1. Female 2. Male

3. Which statement best describes the community in which you teach?

    1. Large central city (e.g. Cleveland, Toledo)
    2. Large suburban community (e.g. Rocky River, Washington Local)
    3. Small suburban community (e.g. Oregon, North Olmstead)
    4. Medium sized city (e.g. Lorain, Lima)
    5. Small city or rural area (e.g. Bowling Green, Norwalk)

4. How many years of teaching have you completed including this year?

    1. 3 or less years
    2. 4 to 7 years
    3. 8 to 12 years
    4. More than 12 years

5. How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers with whom you have worked?

    1. One
    2. Two
    3. Three
    4. Four to six
    5. More than six

6. With how many student teachers have you worked in the last five years? (Include your current student teacher or teachers)

    1. One
    2. Two
    3. Three
    4. Four
    5. Five
    6. Six to ten
    7. More than ten

7. How well do you feel your student teacher was prepared to enter student teaching?

    1. Extremely well prepared
    2. Well prepared
    3. Adequately prepared
    4. Minimally prepared
    5. Inadequately prepared

8. In this assignment, how was your student teacher placed?

1. With you as a single supervising teacher
2. In a team teaching Center (e.g. Whitmer, Navarre)
3. With two or three different teachers (not team teaching)
4. In a special program different from above

9. What is your current teaching assignment?

1. Grades K, 1, 2
2. Grades 3, 4
3. Grades 5, 6
4. All elementary grades
5. Middle School
6. Junior High
7. Senior High
8. All grades K-12

10. To what subject area or teaching field are you primarily assigned? (Check one answer only for items 10 and 11)

1. All elementary subjects
2. Art
3. Business Education
4. English
5. Elementary Departmental or Block Program
6. Elementary Ungraded
7. Foreign Language
8. Home Economics
9. Mathematics
10. Music

11.

1. Physical Ed. Elementary
2. Physical Ed. Secondary
3. Science (Biology, Chemistry Physics)
4. Science (General, Natural, Earth)
5. Social Studies (including History)
6. Social Science-English Combination
7. Special Education
8. Speech
9. Vocational or Industrial Arts
10. Other

QUESTIONS 12 THROUGH 17 deal with any changes in individualized instruction for the pupils which may have resulted from your student teacher's presence.

12. To what extent did your student teacher work with (instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. A little bit
4. Not at all

13. To what extent did you work with individual pupils as compared to when you do not have a student teacher?

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual

14. To what extent was individual help or counseling provided your pupils during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if you had not had a student teacher?

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual

15. To what extent did conferring with your student teacher take your time so you had less time for individual work with pupils?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never

16. To what extent did planning with your student teacher take your time so that you had less time for individual work with pupils?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never

17. To what extent was re-teaching necessary after the student teacher taught?

1.. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never

QUESTIONS 18 THROUGH 26: To what extent were any of the following instructional activities for your pupils changed because of your student teacher's presence?

18. Amount of small group instruction

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

19. Provision for makeup work

1. Much greater
2. Somewhat greater
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

20. Follow-up exams

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer

21. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

22. Supervision of study periods

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply

23. Supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply

24. Amount of material covered

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less

25. Discipline

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer

26. Motivation of pupils

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer

QUESTIONS 27 THROUGH 34 deal with the contributions your student teacher may have made to the school program. Did your student teacher make any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

27. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No
4. Don't know

28. Give talk to parent's group?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No
4. Don't know

29. Perform recess, lunch, playground, or hall duty?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. No
4. Don't know

30. Did your student teacher bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?

1. A great many 2. Some 3. No

31.. Did your student teacher suggest or provide any other kinds of aid or ideas?

1. A great many 2. Some 3. No

32. What use were you able to make of the contributions (30 and 31) of your student teacher?

1. I used them
2. I did not use them
3. I had to discourage him from contributing too freely
4/ My student teacher really did not have too much to offer

33. How many hours per week on the average did your student teacher teach your assigned classes?

1. Less than an hour per week
2. 1 to 5 hours per week
3. 6 to 10 hours per week
4. 11 to 15 h/wk.
5. 16 to 20 h/wk.
6. More than 20 h/wk.

34. How many hours per week on the average were you able to be away from the classroom while your student teacher was teaching your assigned classes?

1. Less than one
2. 1 to 5
3. 6 to 10
4. 11 to 15
5. 16 to 20
6. more than 20

QUESTIONS 35 THROUGH 43: T what extent did you engage in any of the following activities during the time your student teacher was teaching?

35. Team teaching with your student teacher?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all

36. Visitation in other classrooms or schools?

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

37. Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff?

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

38. Research

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

39. Professional reading or writing

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

40. Working with staff of school or department

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

41. Participating in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

42. Assisting the principal or other teachers

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

43. Social or recreational activities (coffee breaks, workouts)

1. A great deal 2. To some extent 3. Not at all

44. How many hours per week on the average do you estimate you spent in the physical presence (close enough to see or talk with) of your student teacher?

1. Less than 10
2. 10 to 15
3. 16 to 20
4. 21 to 25
5. 26 to 30
6. 31 to 35
7. 36 to 40
8. More than 40

45. How did the presence of a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week you spent at school as compared to when you do not have a student teacher?

1. Added more than 6 h/wk.
2. Added 3 to 6 h/wk.
3. Added 1 to 3 h/wk.
4. Added up to 1 extra h/wk.
5. Had no effect
6. Reduced by up to 1 h/wk.
7. Reduced by 1 to 3 h/wk.
8. Reduced by 3 to 6 h/wk.
9. Reduced more than 6 h/wk.

46. How did your student teacher's presence affect the average number of hours per week you worked on job related activities away from school?

1. Added more than 6 h/wk.
2. Added 3 to 6 h/wk.
3. Added 1 to 3 h/wk.
4. Added up to 1 extra h/wk.
5. Had no effect
6. Reduced by up to 1 h/wk.
7. Reduced by 1 to 3 h/wk.
8. Reduced by 3 to 6 h/wk.
9. Reduced more than 6 h/wk.

QUESTIONS 47 THROUGH 50: To what extent was the time you spent on any of the following activities changed because of your student teacher's presence?

47. Teaching

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

48. Lesson planning

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

49. Paper grading

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

50. Help to individual students

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal

QUESTIONS 51 THROUGH 57: To what extent did you engage in the following activities because of the presence of the student teacher?

51. Planning with or for your student teacher

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

52. Evaluating your student teacher's progress or activities

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

53. Holding casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

54. Preparing additional reports

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

55. Making additional preparation for teaching

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

56. Holding telephone conversations or other conferences with your student teacher

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

57. How many times per week on the average did you have contact with your student teacher outside of regular working hours at the school? (Telephone, conferences, social)

1. None
2. 1 to 3
3. 4 to 6
4. 7 to 9
5. 10 or more

58. How many days during student teaching did your student teacher handle classes for you while you were away for reasons other than student teaching business (Professional work, request of the principal or other people, personal or private affairs outside of school) in which a substitute would have had to be hired if the student teacher had not been there?

1. None
2. Less than one
3. 1 to 3
4. 4 to 7
5. 8 to 10
6. More than 10

59. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on your own teaching performance?

1. Has made me a much more effective teacher
2. Has made me a more effective teacher
3. Has had no effect on my teaching
4. Has made me a less effective teacher
5. Has made me a much less effective teacher

60. What do you think the attitude of the administration and teachers in your school should be about working with student teachers?

1. Should aggressively seek student teachers
2. Should seek student teachers
3. Should accept student teachers
4. Should resist having student teachers in the school
5. Should refuse to have student teachers in the school

61. If you were starting over, would you accept another student teacher with similar credentials from the same institution under the same general circumstances?

1. I would accept with enthusiasm
2. I would accept
3. I feel neutral about it
4. I would probably decline
5. I would refuse

62. How much help has the university coordinator (supervisor) provided you?

1. All the help I felt was necessary
2. Most of the help I felt was needed
3. Some of the help I felt was needed
4. Little of the help I felt was needed
5. No help at all

63. How many times did you request help from the university coordinator (supervisor)?

1. Many times
2. Several times
3. Not at all

64. Has the university coordinator been helpful to you with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching?

1. He has gone out of his way to be helpful
2. He has helped when asked
3. He has not helped
4. No such help was needed

65. Would you want your student teacher to teach in your building or system next year?

1. Yes
2. No, but would recommend him in a different system or building
3. No

66. Why was this student teacher assigned to you?

1. I voluteered since I feel a professional obligation to help prepare future teachers
2. I volunteered only because I fely pressure from an administrator to do so
3. I volunteered because I thought a student teacher would be helpful to me in performing my school duties
4. I volunteered because I felt that as a team we could provide exceptional educational experiences for the pupils.
5. I did not volunteer but was requested by an administrator to take the student teacher
6. I was forced to work with the student teacher against my will

Appendix C

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which of the following are you now?

    1. A single student teacher
    2. A married student teacher

2. What is your sex?

    1. Male 2. Female

3. Which statement best describes the community in which you are doing student teaching?

    1. Large central city (e.g. Cleveland, Toledo)
    2. Large suburban community (e.g. Rocky River, Washington Local)
    3. Small suburban community (e.g. Oregon, North Olmstead)
    4. Medium sized city (e.g. Lorain, Lima)
    5. Small city or rural area (e.g. Bowling Green, Norwalk)

4. How many times have you student taught including the present assignment?

    1. One 2. Two 3. Three

5. In this assignment, how were you placed?

    1. With a single supervising teacher
    2. In a team teaching Center (e.g. Whitmer, Navarre)
    3. With two or three different teachers (but not team teaching)
    4. In a special program different from above.

6. What is your primary student teaching assignment?

    1. Grades K, 1, 2
    2. Grades 3,4
    3. Grades 5,6
    4. All elementary grades
    5. Middle School
    6. Junior High
    7. Senior High
    8. All grades K-12

7. To what subject area or teaching field were you primarily assigned for student teaching? (Check one answer only for Questions 7 and 8)

    1. All elementary subjects
    2. Art
    3. Business Education
    4. English
    5. Elementary Departmental or Block Program
    6. Elementary Ungraded
    7. Foreign Language
    8. Home Economics
    9. Mathematics
    10. Music

8.

1. Physical Education (El)
2. Physical Education (Sec)
3. Science (Biology, Chemistry Physics)
4. Science (General, Natural, Earth)
5. Social Studies (including History)
6. Social Science-English Combination
7. Special Education
8. Speech
9. Vocational or Industrial Arts
10. Other

QUESTIONS 9 THROUGH 14 deal with any changes in individualized instruction provided for the pupils which may have resulted from your presence.

9. To what extent did <u>you</u> work with (instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. A little bit
4. Not at all

10. To what extent did your <u>supervising</u> <u>teacher</u> work with individual pupils as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual
6. Don't know

11. To what extent was individual help or counseling provided the pupils during non-class hours as compared to what would have been possible if you had not been present?

1. Much more than usual
2. Somewhat more than usual
3. About the same as usual
4. Somewhat less than usual
5. Much less than usual
6. Don't know

12. To what extent did conferring with you take time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Don't know

13. To what extent did planning with you take the time of the teacher so he had less time for individual work with pupils?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Don't know

14. To what extent was re-teaching necessary after you taught?

1. Frequently
2. Sometimes
3. Seldom
4. Never
5. Don't know

QUESTIONS 15 THROUGH 23: To what extent were any of the following instructional activities for the pupils in your supervising teachers assigned classes changed because of your presence?

15. Amount of small group instruction

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

16. Provision for make-up work

1. Much greater
2. Somewhat greater
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

17. Follow-up exams

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

18. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

19. Supervision of study periods

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply
7. Don't know

20. Supervision of playgrounds, hallways, etc.

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Does not apply
7. Don't know

21. Amount of material covered

1. Much more
2. Somewhat more
3. No change
4. Somewhat less
5. Much less
6. Don't know

22. Discipline

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

23. Motivation of pupils

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. No change
4. Somewhat poorer
5. Much poorer
6. Don't know

QUESTIONS 24 THROUGH 31 deal with the contributions you may have made to the school program. Did you make any specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

24. Supervise youth groups in meetings, programs, trips, tours, etc.?

1. Often 2. Sometimes 3. No

25. Give talks to parent's groups?

1. Often 2. Sometimes 3. No

26. Perform recess, lunch, playground, or hall duty?

1. Often 2. Sometimes 3. No

27. Did you bring, develop, provide, or suggest any new or different instructional materials?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No
4. I am not sure

28. Did you suggest or provide any other kinds of aid or ideas?

1. A great many
2. Some
3. No
4. I am not sure

29. How do you feel your contributions (27 and 28) were received?

1. They were used
2. They were not used
3. I was discouraged from making such contributions
4. I really did not have much to offer

30. How many hours per week on the average did you teach your supervising teacher's assigned classes?

1. Less than an hour a week
2. One to five hours per week
3. Six to 10 hours per week
4. Eleven to fifteen h/wk.
5. Sixteen to Twenty h/wk.
6. More than twenty h/wk.

31. How many hours per week on the average was your supervising teacher away from the classroom while you were teaching his assigned classes?

1. Less than 1
2. 1 to 5
3. 6 to 10
4. 11 to 15
5. 16 to 20
6. More than twenty

QUESTIONS 32 THROUGH 40: To what extent did your supervising teacher engage in any of the following activities during the time you were teaching in his assigned class?

32. Team teaching with you?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

33. Visitation in other classrooms or schools?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

34. Committee work in the school with pupils and/or staff?

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

35. Research

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

36. Professional reading or writing

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

37. Work with staff of school or department

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

38. Participating in supervising teacher seminars or other in-service activities dealing with student teaching

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

39. Assisting the principal or other teachers

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

40. Social or recreational activities (coffee breaks, workouts)

1. A great deal
2. To some extent
3. Not at all
4. Don't know

41. How many hours per week on the average do you estimate you spent in the physical presence (close enough to see or talk with) of your supervising teacher?

1. Less than 10
2. 10 to 15
3. 16 to 20
4. 21 to 25
5. 26 to 30
6. 31 to 35
7. 36 to 40
8. more than 40

42. How did your presence as a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week your supervising teacher spent at school as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?

1. Added more than 6 h/wk.
2. Added 3 to 6 h/wk.
3. Added 1 to 3 h/wk.
4. Added up to 1 h/wk.
5. Had no effect
6. Reduced by up to 1 h/wk.
7. Reduced by 1 to 3 h/wk.
8. Reduced by 3 to 6 h/wk.
9. Reduced by more than 6 h/wk.
10. I am unable to judge.

QUESTION 43 THROUGH 46: To what extent was the time your supervising teacher spent on the following activities changed because of your presence?

43. Teaching

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

44. Lesson planning

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

45. Paper grading

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

46. Help to individual students

1. Increased a great deal
2. Increased to some extent
3. Remained about the same
4. Reduced to some extent
5. Reduced a great deal
6. Don't know

QUESTION 47 THROUGH 52: To what extent did your supervising teacher engage in the following activities because of your presence?

47. Planning with you

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

48. Evaluating your progress and activities

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

49. Holding casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

50. Preparing additional reports

1. A great many extra hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

51. Making additional preparations for teaching

1. A great many hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

52. Holding telephone conversations or other conferences with you

1. A great many hours
2. Some extra hours
3. No extra hours

53. How many times per week on the average did you have contact with your supervising teacher outside of regular working hours at school?

1. Less than 1
2. 1 to 3
3. 4 to 6
4. 7 to 9
5. 10 or more

54. How many hours do you estimate you spent doing volunteer work in the community where you were assigned for student teaching (youth groups, home service, church work, and the like) during your student teaching period?

1. None at all
2. 1 to 5 hours
3. 6 to 15 hours
4. 16 to 30 hours
5. more than 30 hours.

55. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the performance of your supervising teacher?

1. Has made him a much more effective teacher
2. Has made him a more effective teacher
3. Has had no effect on his teaching
4. Has made him a less effective teacher
5. Has made him a much less effective teacher
6. I am unable to judge

56. What do you think should be the attitude of the administration and teachers in the school to which you were assigned about working with student teachers?

1. Should aggressively seek student teachers
2. Should seek student teachers
3. Should accept student teachers if asked
4. Should resist having student teachers in the school
5. Should refuse to have student teachers in the school
6. I am unable to judge

57. What recommendations would you give your friends about accepting a student teaching assignment in the same school with the same supervising teacher (or in the same project)?

1. Accept with enthusiasm
2. Accept
3. Be neutral
4. Try a different assignmen
5. Reject the assignment

58. How much help has the university coordinator (supervisor) provided you?

1. All the help I felt was necessary
2. Most of the help I felt was needed
3. Some of the help I felt was needed
4. Little of the help I felt was needed
5. No help at all

59. How many times did you request help from the university coordinator (supervisor)?

1. ~~A great~~ many times
2. several times
3. Not at all

60. To what extent have your supervising teacher and/or other school personnel been helpful to you on matters concerned with student teaching?

1. They have gone out of their way to be helpful
2. They have helped when asked
3. They have not helped
4. No help was needed

61. Would you accept a teaching position if offered for next year in the building or system in which you did your student teaching?

    1. Yes
    2. No, because I intend to go to graduate school
    3. No, because I plan to live in another geographic area
    4. No, for personal reasons
    5. No, for professional reasons
    6. No, because I have decided not to teach

62. Why were you assigned to this particular student teaching situation?

    1. I requested this school or area.
    2. I requested this kind of program or project
    3. I had no particular preference and was placed in this assignment by the university
    4. I really preferred a different assignment but was placed in this one by the university
    5. I was required to accept this assignment even though I expressed a strong preference for a different one.